

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 8, 2005. Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-5 and 7-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawamura et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,683). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it will be noted that independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claims 6 and 8. These limitations set forth in more detail the construction of the first and second panel members, the dividers separating the housing into a paper supply compartment and a printed paper compartment. Additional limitations have been added to more positively point out the structural relationship of the supply paper exit port and the printed paper entry port. In particular, the limitations added more positively recite that each of these ports is formed in an interior wall portion, with the printed paper entry port being spaced apart from said paper supply exit port.

The above structure is not shown or suggested by Kawamura et al. Kawamura et al is related to a video printer in which paper sheets 12 are fed by a pickup roller 8 towards an ink sheet 3, and then back around past the thermal head 1 and routed via a switching guide 6 through a paper ejecting roller 20 into a paper collection area. However, the ports through which the paper exits the paper supply area and then returns to the paper collection area are not formed a common wall portion. The

structure of Kawamura et al appears more complex and would appear to require additional components for rerouting the printed-on paper back into the paper collection area via the switching guide 6.

The present invention does not require any form of switching guide, such as guide 6 used in Kawamura et al. By providing spaced apart ports for the paper to pass through as it leaves the paper supply compartment and then returns to the printed paper compartment, the chance of a paper jam would appear to be significantly reduced.

In view of the following, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6, 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,683) in view of what the Examiner termed was the Applicant's admitted prior art. In view of the foregoing remarks, and the cancellation of Claim 6, reconsideration of this rejection is most respectfully requested. There is no suggestion or disclosure in Kawamura et al for forming both of the ports through which the paper passes when the paper moves from the paper supply compartment to the printed paper compartment, in a common wall portion. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 11, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/cmn